

**COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
JANUARY 9, 2006– 7:00 P.M.**

**CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR  
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE**

**Board Members**

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Cumulative From 10/05</u>	
			<u>(P)</u>	<u>(A)</u>
Jennie Brooks	P		3	0
Marie Conroy	P		1	2
Marjorie Davis		A	0	3
John Hurley	P		3	0
Robert Pascal		A	0	3
Sanford Rosenthal	P		3	0
Diane Schuster		A	2	1
Robert Smith	P		3	0
William Goetz	P		3	0
Michael Kimmey	P		2	1
Alfred Imgrund	P		2	1
Avery Dial	P		3	0
Margaret Birch	P		1	1
Fenel Antoine		A	0	1

**Staff Present:**

Assistant City Attorney  
Margaret Hayes, Housing & Community Development  
Leon Burgess, Housing & Community Development  
Susan Batchelder, Housing & Community Development

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

**Guests**

None

**Call to Order**

Chair John Hurley called the meeting to order at approximately 7:02 p.m., roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

**New Member**

Margarette Hayes announced that Fenel Antoine was recently appointed to this Board. She continued stating that Margaret Birch was a new appointee to the Board also.

**New Member Introduction**

Margaret Birch stated that she was a life-long resident of this City, and had worked in the school system for many years. She retired as a school administrator and has served on many boards throughout the City.

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Board and Staff Introductions**

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 2

Margarette Hayes stated that the following staff members were present at tonight's meeting: Susan Batchelder, Community Development; Leon Burgess, Community Development; and Margarette Hayes, Community Development.

**Approval of Minutes – November 14, 2005 Meeting**

William Goetz stated that the last paragraph of the minutes included some discussion regarding the Pledge of Allegiance, but he felt that discussion should have been omitted from the minutes.

Chair John Hurley stated that he stood behind everything that he had stated.

Jennie Brooks stated that everyone is aware of the fact that the meetings are being taped, and therefore, all discussions are included in the minutes.

Marie Conroy stated that she had not been in attendance at the November meeting, and therefore, asked for some further clarification of the discussion.

Chair John Hurley stated that he believed there had been more give and take on the subject which had not been included in the minutes, and therefore, they appeared out of context.

Marie Conroy stated that in general it was her understanding that this Board felt some matters had been moved forward without proper discussion.

Chair John Hurley stated that was not the idea that had been discussed.

Jennie Brooks stated that it was her understanding that part of the context of the discussion had been lost in the transcription because the subject matter had been discussed seriously, but things had been said in a jovial manner.

Margarette Hayes stated that this is not a verbatim transcript, but an attempt is being made to include all discussions that occur.

Alfred Imgrund asked if there had been any misquotes in the transcription. Chair John Hurley stated that he had not been misquoted, but some of the context of how the discussion occurred had been lost.

Michael Kimmey suggested that the words "jokingly" could be added into the minutes.

Chair John Hurley stated that he would like to correct the minutes and state that in the context the discussion had occurred in an off-handed joking manner.

**Motion** made by Jennie Brooks and seconded by Robert Smith to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2005 meeting as corrected. Board approved with the exception of Alfred Imgrund who voted "nay."

Avery Dial stated that on page 3 of the minutes, last sentence read: "He stated that for new grantees....," and it should read "He stated that for new grantees...."

**Motion** made by Robert Smith and seconded by Jennie Brooks to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2005 meeting as corrected. Board unanimously approved.

**Review of Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Community Development Block Grant Application Process**

Margarette Hayes stated that Dr. Goetz had made some recommendations regarding the ranking process, which was utilized by the applicants applying for the Community Development Block Grant public services dollars. The Board had authorized Dr. Goetz to meet with staff in connection with reviewing the ranking process, and make appropriate changes. Then, the recommendations would be brought before this Board for their review.

Margarette Hayes explained that the Board had been provided with a copy of the application that would be available on February 6, 2006, along with the ranking considerations that were to be revised, for their review.

Chair John Hurley clarified that the documents distributed to the Board were the result of the meetings between Dr. Goetz and staff. Margarette Hayes confirmed. Chair John Hurley asked if the Board was being asked for further input, or were they to review it until next month and then vote on the recommendations. Margarette Hayes stated that they could not wait until next month for the Board's approval since the applications went on the street on February 6, 2006. The Board was to make a determination regarding the proposed changes or make further changes at tonight's meeting.

Chair John Hurley asked Dr. Goetz to briefly explain the changes that were being made from last year's application.

Dr. Goetz stated that the basic idea was to have the applicants present their information in a more simplified manner, such as cash-on-hand, instead of providing an income debit statement making it easier for the Board to analyze the applicant's financial situation. Evidence was also to be provided as to the effectiveness of the applicant's program. He explained that some of the categories had been separated.

Margarette Hayes explained that on the first page under "Leveraging and Assets," the prior application listed this item as "Local Support and Leveraging." She further stated that they had deleted the point structure, and Dr. Goetz felt that the Board needed to be more objective in their thought process when judging the basis of the applicant's ability to leverage funds, along with their assets. She said that in that area the percentage of points funded by the Community Development Block Grant had changed. In addition, they added that the applicant had to provide evidence of a current financial statement that would show their cash-on-hand, and the existence of the organization's expenses and income for the last two years. If that was not applicable, then the applicant had to indicate that on the application. She further stated that in the last assessment that was 30 points, and now that amount of points would remain the same.

Marie Conroy asked if when referring to cash-on-hand was that a reference to whether they received monies from other organizations. Dr. Goetz stated that he wanted two figures. One figure was the cash-on-hand in the sense of whether they spent the monies given to their organization or not. Marie Conroy asked if that was the case normally in a non-profit situation. It was her understanding that all funds had to be used during the year.

Margarette Hayes stated that was not always the case. She further stated that they might have cash-on-hand, but as an agency this was one of the activities they might be funding. Therefore, the Board should consider as part of their assessment the applicant's financial capacity in leveraging their assets, and what other activities they were they involved in. She stated that Dr. Goetz wanted an overview of the applicant's overall financial situation.

Jennie Brooks stated that even though an applicant might have cash-on-hand, they should not be penalized because they had excess cash at the time. Dr. Goetz explained that was not the

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 4

intent, but that it would supply extra information to the Board for their consideration. Jennie Brooks stated that monies could be owed by the applicant that they had not yet distributed, and therefore, they showed extra cash-on-hand.

Margarette Hayes reiterated that could depend on the size of the organization. Jennie Brooks agreed. Margarette Hayes explained further that a larger organization might have a longer tenure in the public sector, which dictated their success, and part of the tenure provided them with the capacity to solicit and build an asset base. She explained that Dr. Goetz felt that would serve as a photograph of the total picture.

Alfred Imgrund stated that each of the applicants would appear before this Board and have the opportunity to explain their information. He stated the recommendations were good, and the extra information would assist them in making their decisions. He felt the applicants would have ample opportunity to defend their positions, as they had done in the past.

Chair John Hurley stated that all the objective rankings and points were part of the process, but when the applicants made their plea, he felt decisions were made a lot of times on one's gut feelings. He felt Dr. Goetz was leading them in the right direction, but he wanted the Board to keep in mind the context of the situation.

Jennie Brooks stated that she did not object to the recommendations being made, but she wanted to make sure that the Board did not get side tracked just because an applicant had extra cash-on-hand so they would not be penalized.

Dr. Goetz stated that the intent was not to penalize someone, but to have all information available to assist the Board in making their decisions.

Jennie Brooks reiterated that the extra information could prove to be an asset to the Board in making their decisions, and she had no objections.

Margarette Hayes stated that as they reviewed each recommendation, she would need to know if there was a consensus of the Board so staff would know how to proceed.

Robert Smith suggested that the words "unallocated/un-earmarked" cash-on-hand be listed on the form.

Chair John Hurley stated that everyone was discussing this in the abstract because they were arguing about what they were going to be arguing about, but the bottom line was that the applicants would come before this Board and issues would be raised, and then, the items could be addressed.

Dr. Goetz stated that the point structure had been deleted for individual items. He explained that his intent was that when the Board evaluated the quality of the program being offered, they would review the application as a whole.

Chair John Hurley reiterated that the bottom line was that the applicants would come before the Board, questions would be asked, and then decisions made. He felt they did not need to get caught up in minute details because the Board had done this enough times to know whether an applicant needed the funds or not, and whether the programs being offered were worthy ones.

Marie Conroy stated that Dr. Goetz had raised some good points when the Board reviewed the process last year. One of those points was for the Board to see how the applicants were managing their funds in general. She believed that was the intent of this recommendation, and thought it would be very helpful.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 5

Margarette Hayes stated that the second item was quality, and previously there had only been a general paragraph. She stated that Dr. Goetz had suggested they "bullet point" it to make it more viewer friendly. In regard to the statement: "Is the program designed to provide maximum benefits of clients to be served? Yes or No. Amount in percent of grant to directly benefit clients," they were asking for the amount of money and the percentage of the grant that would direct the benefit to the clients. She stated that would also apply to the statement: "Amount and percent of grant to be used by administration for salaries, etc., and then the cost of client served." She added that the point structure was also the same.

Margarette Hayes further stated that under #3, "Effectiveness," again bullet points were used. She stated that the prior year's ranking consideration was "quality/cost effectiveness." She stated that specific evidence of the effectiveness of the same program in the past, evidence of the effectiveness of similar programs, evaluation criteria for the effectiveness of the program, would all be things the Board would be looking through when making their assessment of each individual application. She further read: "How the targeted population, that's a low-mod income residence, is impacted by these criteria (before and after), if a prior program effectiveness of program based on the evaluation criteria, short and long-term effectiveness of a program, and evidence of effectiveness compared to a similar program in the City, County, or State." She explained that point structure was to be 30 points.

Margaret Birch asked if all these information would be before the Board regarding similar programs in the City, County and State when doing the evaluations.

Margarette Hayes stated that in the application, they were asking the applicant to provide such information as part of their package.

Dr. Goetz stated that there might not be similar programs, and therefore, that would have to be taken into consideration.

Margarette Hayes stated that #4, "Experience of staff," the Board would be assessing the qualifications of the applicants, the principals, increasing their staff, and staff's past performance, which would be 10 points. In regard to "community and support," they had broken out "Experience/Community Support" last year, and they are assessing a letter of support from community organizations and the community, along with any awards they received or other recognition regarding their programs or project managers. She explained that they were again asking for certification as to whether the program was ever offered in the community. She remarked that would equal 10 points.

Margaret Birch stated that 10 points was being given under community support, but there was a note saying "applications submitted without the minimum letters of support will receive a very low grading from City staff." She felt that sounded subjective. She asked what was meant by "low grading from City staff," and she felt they needed to be more specific.

Margarette Hayes asked if the recommendation was that 5 points would be deducted if the appropriate support letters were not submitted.

Dr. Goetz stated that if the letters were not submitted, he felt that could be taken into consideration of the application as a whole, and the points could be decided at that time. He continued stating that this was to be used as a guide, but that the application would be considered as a whole.

Margarette Hayes stated that phrase could be deleted. Sanford Rosenthal asked if they were saying it was ambiguous. Margarette Hayes confirmed and stated that such phrase could be deleted if the Board wished that to be done.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 6

Chair John Hurley reiterated that they should not get hung up on this becoming a mathematical equation because the points sometimes get thrown out, and a person's gut feeling takes over. He stated that was up to the Board.

Margaret Birch stated that she understood what was being said, but they were specifically stating that the applicant would receive a very low rating from staff.

Margarette Hayes stated that the phrase could be deleted because the Board would make their determination as to what scores would be received.

Margarette Hayes stated that the next item was in regard to spending experience, and last year the application stated as follows:

excellent performance when spending 100% of their funds  
good performance when they spent 75% of their funds  
acceptable performance when they spent less than 75% of their funds

That section totaled 20 points. She advised that the point structure did not change from last year's. She further stated that Dr. Goetz had suggested that a box be supplied to check regarding their spending experience. The actual points would then be awarded on that basis.

Chair John Hurley asked if this was inverted. He asked if poor performance would be if they spent 100% of their funds, and an acceptable performance would be 75%. He explained that if \$1,000 was given to an organization, and at the end of the year they did a great job but did not spend all the money due to cutting corners, he felt that was the opposite of what was being said. He asked if people were being penalized if they did not spend the total amount of funds given to them.

Margarette Hayes stated that the individual was not being penalized, but a point value was being assigned to them based on what the Board assessed as to their ability and capacity to spend the money.

Chair John Hurley further asked if they came under budget, it was not as good as if they came in on budget. Margarette Hayes explained that would be up to the Board to determine.

Dr. Goetz stated that Mr. Hurley raised a good point, but if the words "excellent, good and acceptable" were deleted, it could provide additional latitude for the Board in making their determination. He reiterated that this was just a consideration and it could be modified further.

Robert Smith stated that they got audited by HUD and if all the monies were not spent, that was not in their favor. Cuts were then made the following year.

Margarette Hayes reiterated that in regard to that assessment, if someone applied for funds, who had not used all their monies in the past year, would the Board give them a full point structure. She stated they were attempting to keep the objectivity as a part of this. She stated that the words "excellent, good and acceptable" could be deleted by the Board when making their final determination.

Margarette Hayes continued stating that another item for consideration was in regard to the uniqueness of the project. Last year they offered a bonus of 20 points for this.

Margarette Hayes asked for the Board's input in regard to the recommendations being presented.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 7

Chair John Hurley stated that he felt the document could remain as presented, but the bottom line was that this was just a guide and it would not be a mathematical equation. He felt they should move forward with this, but remember that it was only a guide.

**Motion** made by Alfred Imgrund and seconded by Jennie Brooks to adopt the ranking considerations as discussed and modified in regard to the applications for the CDBG funds.

Michael Kimmey stated that last year some of the categories had been based on the financial statements and scores had been provided by staff, and he asked if that was still going to be done this year. He asked if this would all be subjective this year.

Margarette Hayes stated that the figures regarding spending experience had been supplied by staff in the past, and that would still be done this year for informational purposes.

Michael Kimmey asked if the new structure was going to be all subjective. Dr. Goetz stated that staff would still inform the Board as to the percentage of funds that had been spent.

Margarette Hayes explained that the Board would fill in the points, but staff would advise what percentage of their funds had been spent in the previous year.

Sanford Rosenthal asked if anything was included regarding first-timers versus second-timers. He thought first-timers should have a better chance to obtain the funds.

Margarette Hayes stated that discussion keeps coming out, and Mr. Rosenthal had determined last year that he wanted individuals to continue to apply, but the funds did not have to be granted. She reiterated that all applications could be submitted, and then it would be up to the Board to make their determinations.

Avery Dial stated that he felt the system had a built-in check and balance on it since repeat applicants had a history whether good or bad. He further stated that regarding the spending experience category, he felt the situation had to be analyzed and all circumstances considered.

Margarette Hayes asked if it was the consensus of the Board that for the actual spending experience the rating factors would be deleted, but staff would advise what percentage of funds had been spent. Chair John Hurley confirmed.

Margarette Hayes stated that the same documentation had been provided regarding leveraging last year, and she asked if the Board wanted that information this year. The Board agreed that such information should be provided to them by staff.

Board unanimously approved the above motion.

Margarette Hayes thanked Dr. Goetz for his input regarding the application.

Dr. Goetz stated that the staff was very good in massaging his recommendations, and thanked them for their efforts and hard work.

Robert Smith asked about clarification regarding site visits.

Margarette Hayes stated that would be discussed tonight under "other business."

**Other Business**

Workshops

## COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 8

Margarette Hayes stated that a question had been raised at a previous meeting regarding workshops. She stated that the City Clerk's office advised that no such workshops had been held.

Dr. Goetz stated that information was not correct because he had attended such meetings, unless their definition of a workshop was different.

Margarette Hayes asked Dr. Goetz for his definition of a workshop. Dr. Goetz explained that the Utility Board had brought in experts from throughout the Country to discuss how they dealt with energy and related matters. Margarette Hayes stated that she had also been informed that any costs involved with such a workshop would have to be borne by the Board concerned. She explained that from the City Clerk's office, their definition of a workshop was a discussion of items among board members in regard to the Board and its functions. Also, the meeting would have to be publicly noticed due to the Sunshine Law requirements. She reiterated that she had been informed that no such notices had been issued by the City Clerk.

Margaret Birch stated that some of the meetings had been called forums and were done under the direction and with the cooperation of the City. She stated that one of the meetings had been called The Energy Roundtable. She felt it was very informative and educational.

### Site Visits

Margarette Hayes stated that site visits could be made but not in groups.

### Funding Cycle Rankings

Margarette Hayes stated that regarding the funding cycle rankings, which the Board had just approved, the planning meetings were listed in the package and would begin on February 1, 2006. She added that the Emergency Shelter Grant and HOPWA planning meeting would be held on that date at 12:00 noon, and on February 2, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. would be the Community Development and Block Grant meeting. She urged the Board members to attend those meetings if possible. Applications would be available as of February 6, 2006. She explained further that such applications could be e-mailed, faxed put on disk, or mailed.

Margarette Hayes advised that the applications were due back on March 6, 2006 and the 3:00 p.m. deadline was adhered to. Any applications received after that deadline would not be accepted for consideration.

Margarette Hayes announced that on April 10, 2006, the Board would conduct their first review of the proposals and presentations. She asked for the Board members to mark their calendars with that date because staff anticipated a large number of applications to be submitted due to all the budget cuts being made everywhere. She advised that if all proposals and presentations were not heard and reviewed on April 10, 2006, another meeting would be scheduled for April 17, 2006. She advised further that the public hearing before the City Commission to approve this Board's recommendations was being projected for June 20, 2006.

### Workforce Housing

Margarette Hayes announced that a Workforce Housing public meeting would be held. She stated that such housing was designated for individuals earning between 80% and 120% of the area medium income. This Board worked with staff regarding affordable housing, but there were a number of people who fell into these categories, such as firefighters, teachers, nurses, paramedics, office workers, and police. She stated these were people who earned too large of an income to receive any type of subsidy regarding affordable housing, but still needed assistance. She explained that Commissioner Moore started this initiative about a year ago and



COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

JANUARY 9, 2006

PAGE 9

two roundtable discussions had been held. A consultant was authorized by the City Commission to conduct a workforce housing study. This Board would not be impacted by that study, but it showed there was a need for some type of assistance for such individuals. The report was made by the consultant to the City Commission on December 20<sup>th</sup> and the recommendation made by the City Commission was to hold a public forum to receive input on this matter. Policy decisions would have to be made based on such input. Commissioner Moore hoped that possibly an ordinance would be created regarding this matter. She proceeded to invite the Board to a meeting being held on Saturday, January 21, 2006 from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. and lunch would be served.

Margarette Hayes stated that once a final determination was made, she would report back to this Board.

Staff Promotion

Margarette Hayes announced that Susan Batchelder has been promoted as her Assistant Manager, due to the fact that her duties had been expanded extensively. She stated that Ms. Batchelder was very competent and had worked extensively in Community Inspections and Code Enforcement.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl